

### REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 25, 2010. Claims 31, 32, 35-37, and 39-43 are presented for examination, of which Claims 31, 36, and 37 are in independent form. Claims 1-30 and 44 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter presented therein. Claims 31, 35, 37, 39, 42, and 43 have been amended to define aspects of Applicants' invention more clearly. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Initially, the Examiner is thanked for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview held on July 8, 2010, to discuss the rejections issued in the March 25, 2010, Office Action. It is believed that this response, in conjunction with the Interview Summary issued by the Examiner, represents a complete written statement as to the substance of the interview, in accordance with M.P.E.P. § 713.04.

Claim 44 was objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(b) as being a duplicated claim. Without conceding the propriety of this objection, Claim 44 has been canceled, rendering moot this objection and the rejections to Claim 44 discussed below.

Claims 39-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants have carefully reviewed and amended Claims 39 and 42, as deemed necessary, to ensure that Claim 39-43 conform fully to the requirements of Section 112, second paragraph, with special attention to the points raised in section 3 of the Office Action. It is believed that the rejections under Section 112, second paragraph, have been obviated, and their withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 37, 43 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Although it is not conceded that the rejection is correct or valid, Claims

37 and 43 have been amended as deemed necessary to ensure that they conforms fully to the requirements of Section 101, with special attention to the points raised in paragraph 4 of the Office Action. It is believed that the rejections under Section 101 have been obviated, and their withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

The Office Action indicates that Claims 31, 32, 35 and 36 are allowed.

Accordingly, this Amendment After Final Action is believed to place the present application in condition for allowance. Therefore, entry of this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is believed proper and is respectfully requested, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and an early passage to issue of the present application.

No petition to extend the time for response to the Office Action is deemed necessary for this Amendment. If, however, such a petition is required to make this Amendment timely filed, then this paper should be considered such a petition and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite petition fee to Deposit Account 50-3939.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan Berschadsky/  
Jonathan Berschadsky  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 46,551

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
1290 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10104-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200